

The correct scientific name of the Palawan Peacock-pheasant is *Polyplectron napoleonis* Lesson, 1831

by Edward C. Dickinson

Received 20 December 2000

During foundation work for a planned handbook of the birds of Asia it became clear that the scientific name of the Palawan Peacock-pheasant needed re-examination. Lesson (1831a) named this peacock-pheasant *Polyplectrum Napoleonis* on the basis of a specimen in the hands of Prince Victor Massena, Duc de Rivoli, who had it painted by Huet (Lesson 1831a). Massena (c. 1795-1863), a descendant of one of Napoleon Bonaparte's marshals, was also 3rd Prince d'Essling and his collection, now at the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia (Stone 1899), is sometimes connected with each of the names Massena, Rivoli and Essling. Lesson (1831a, p. 487) suggested that the bird was from "Inde" but provided no description. Two months later Lesson (1831b, p. 650) described the bird, although its true origin was unknown. The specific name of this peacock-pheasant has subsequently undergone several changes and my aim is to demonstrate that *napoleonis* remains correct. The same specimen, now reported it to be in the collection of the Prince d'Essling, was depicted, again by Huet, for pl. 540 in Temminck & Laugier (1820-39). Temminck named it *Polyplectron emphanum*.

The British Museum acquired a specimen from Verreaux Frères some time before 1863 but again the true origin was unclear. Sclater (1863), under the emended name *Polyplectron emphanes*, suggested, doubtfully, Borneo and Gray (1867) the Moluccas. In January 1878, Alfred Everett collected specimens in Palawan that seemed to show that this was its real source (Tweeddale 1878). For a few years this was generally accepted and fresh specimens were taken in Palawan in 1887 by Whitehead (1890) and in 1888 by the Platens (Blasius 1888a). The Platens' specimens in Braunschweig were eventually re-examined and described by Blasius (1891a, b) as *Polyplectron Nehrkor-nae*, who claimed that Palawan birds differed from *napoleonis*. The distinction, between the males, was in the character and extent of the white superciliary stripe. In *nehrkor-nae* the stripe was narrow, associated with a triangular white cheek patch and white ear-coverts, whereas in *napoleonis* the white superciliaries were wide and met on the nape (Ogilvie-Grant 1893).

Ogilvie-Grant (1893) therefore listed both "species", attributing Everett's Palawan material to *nehrkor-nae*, not to *napoleonis*. The only material remaining assigned to *napoleonis* was thus the type, in Philadelphia since 1846, and the British Museum specimen, neither with a proven locality.

Further specimens were obtained in Palawan by the Menage Expedition in 1887-88 and Bourns & Worcester (1894) affirmed that the white facial markings differed

between individuals. The name *napoleonis* was therefore reinstated by Ogilvie-Grant (1897) and used by McGregor (1909) and Beebe (1922).

This name was challenged by Lowe (1925), who considered Lesson's name a *nomen nudum* on p. 487 in April, 1831, with a description in the addenda and corrigenda on p. 650 in June 1831 (Lowe 1925). Temminck's name *emphanum* seemed to date from May 1831 and must, he considered, be accorded priority. This view was followed by Peters (1934) and Delacour (1951) and universally since then. Here I propose that Lowe's case must fall in the face of fresh evidence.

The correct date of *Polyplectron emphanum* Temminck

The book in which the name *emphanum* appeared, *Nouveau Recueil de Planches Coloriées* (Temminck & Laugier 1820-1839), comprised 102 livraisons. The last contained the index, the first 101 contained 600 plates. These had been promised at the rate of 6 per livraison. The difficulties of dating the parts was recounted by Crotch (1869) and Sherborn (1898), but the inconsistency of needing 101 parts to issue 600 plates only attracted attention later (Zimmer 1926).

Zimmer also suggested that the methods available for dating individual plates and their texts were not wholly reliable. First, there was sometimes uncertainty in which livraison a plate might appear, and secondly the livraison numbers at the foot of the text pages were sometimes not appropriate in the sense of chronological sequence. Some texts contained references to publications that occurred long afterward, indicating that these pages were later additions to their stated livraisons. Temminck, it seems, was already trying to order his material for eventual binding in systematic order.

Dickinson (2001) resolved why some livraisons had less than six plates, identified the contents of each livraison, and largely corroborated the dating. Enough discrepancies were investigated to show that Temminck did put livraison numbers on text pages that have led later authors to date names without sufficient care and attention, as claimed by Zimmer (1926) and exemplified by this peacock-pheasant.

The name *emphanum* appears in the text that should have been expected to accompany Plate 540 in Temminck & Laugier (1820-1839). At issue is when this plate appeared and also when the text did so. Ogilvie-Grant (1893) cited it as "Pl. Col. v, pl. 18 [No. 540]". This refers to volume 5, which is in accordance with the binding plan or index that Temminck provided in 1839, but pl. 18 is a lapsus for Livr. 88. However, although most texts carried a livraison number at their foot, the place of the number in this case is improbable; these numbers were anyway sometimes wrong, accidentally in some cases but deliberately so if it suited the binding plan.

There were two editions with different page sizes. Where no substitutions took place accounts of each illustrated species seem to begin a fresh page, with the livraison number footnoted, and the texts have a blank space at the end if they are not long enough to fill the page. A comparison of the relevant text in the two editions

shows a different use of page space in the crowded style suggestive of text issued in the context of reissue after page suppression (Table 1).

Comparison of leaf number and page number (Table 1) shows that discrete pages were used in the large format edition for each of the logical parts, *except* for the text for *Polyplectron chalcureum*, which is crammed into the back of the final page. In fact the plate for *Polyplectron chalcureum* was published in livraison 88 (14 May 1831, date *vide* Zimmer 1926), as no doubt was its original page of text, since suppressed. This, I believe, was the only part of these texts that did appear then. On the evidence of the large format edition alone it is possible that the introductory pages (leaf one) came out then, but in the small format edition the introduction continues on leaf two. This introduction mentions plates 539 and 540 (livraison 91, 20 December 1832, date *vide* Zimmer 1926) and the small format edition uses the rest of leaf two for text to plate 539, which would have appeared with that plate. Because *Polyplectron chalcureum* was the first subject to be depicted in livraison 88 it would not have been without text and that text would have begun at the top of its own page. Taken together, the evidence of the use of space for the introductory pages and the 18 month period between livraisons 88 and 91, show that the introduction appeared with the text for plate 539 as part of livraison 91.

TABLE 1

A comparison of the text pages said to be part of Livraison 88 to show differences in the use of page space and the addition of the text for plate 519 out of sequence at the end.

Leaf No.	Page No.	Content in large format edition	Content in small format edition
1	1	Introduction to the genus (introduction mentions plate Nos. 519, 539 and 540)	Introduction to the genus
	2	Introduction to the genus	Introduction to the genus
2	3	<i>Polyplectron chinquis</i> (pl. 539)	Introduction to the genus (top 6 lines); <i>Polyplectron chinquis</i> (rest of page)
	4	<i>Polyplectron chinquis</i>	<i>Polyplectron chinquis</i>
3	5	<i>Argus giganteus</i> (not illustrated) begins a new page	<i>Polyplectron chinquis</i> (but page not fully used)
	6	<i>Argus giganteus</i>	<i>Argus giganteus</i>
4	7	<i>Polyplectron emphanum</i> (pl. 540); begins a new page	<i>Argus giganteus</i>
	8	<i>Polyplectron emphanum</i> (top 6 lines); <i>Polyplectron chalcureum</i> (rest of page) (pl. 519)	<i>Argus giganteus</i> (top half page); <i>Polyplectron emphanum</i> (rest of page)
5	9		<i>Polyplectron emphanum</i>
	10		<i>Polyplectron chalcureum</i>

The two texts for 519 and 540 use the front and back of a single leaf in the large edition, and appear back-to-back on the second of the two leaves affected in the small edition. It has previously been argued that, because they mention livraison 88, these pages appeared in May 1831, 18 months ahead of plate 540; but in neither edition does the text for plate 519 appear first and the way the page-and-a-half of text for plate 540 is placed shows that binding cannot explain this. It is the date of the text that is important: the plates bear French vernacular names, while the scientific names are to be found in the associated text and date from that.

The evidence shows that the inclusion of the text for *Polyplectron chalcurom* (plate 519), after the text of *Polyplectron emphanum* (pl. 540), was an afterthought. Temminck's concern was to have these texts together when they were eventually bound. The evidence of the rather cramped pages, a clue to a case of substitution, is that there were costs to be saved and the use of one leaf less in the large edition may imply that the small appeared first and that greater savings were found for the larger edition.

Plate 519 would, from its number, be expected to appear in Livraison 88. By contrast plate 540 should be expected in livraison 91. Temminck clearly issued fresh text, and suppressed his earlier text, and this implied the cancellation of the original text for plate 519 alone.

My study of every plate in the book and usually the related text showed that Temminck did not publish *any* plates early. Furthermore, Temminck's handwritten list of the plates issued in each livraison, held in Leiden, shows that Plates 539 and 540 were issued as part of livraison 91, and this dates both plates from December 1832, not from May 1831.

When discussed by Tweeddale (1878) the dating of Livraison 88, which was taken from Crotch (1869), was no doubt presumed to relate to text and plate. Lowe (1925) was apparently unaware of the risks of substitution, to be mentioned by Zimmer (1926), and did not realise the significance of the sequence of texts in these pages.

Dickinson (2001) found that Temminck issued a number of replacement pages, and sometimes these had livraison numbers on them that did not tally with their date of issue. In this and other contexts his replacements have additional text that was not on the original page. Thus the extant pages with the texts for plates 519 and 540 back-to-back are substitute pages issued with Livraison 91, and the text for each plate should accordingly be dated May 1831 and December 1832.

The mention of livraison 88 at the foot of the first leaf reflects where Temminck wanted all these pages bound, and what was presumably on his text for plate 519; but it is accurate only in that plate 519, and its original text, did appear in livraison 88. The page layouts in both formats (Table 1) show that the reissue comprised all four (large format) or five (small format) leaves.

The separate parts of Article 21 of the International Code Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999) do not precisely address this case, but in combination they confirm that at least for plate 540 it would be proper to date it from the date of livraison 91.

Before listing the correct citations in chronological sequence of these names it is necessary to refer again to Blasius's name.

***Polyplectron nehrkornae* Blasius and its correct citation**

The name *Polyplectron nehrkornae* Blasius, 1891, is cited from *Mitt. orn. Ver. Wien*, p. 1 (Ogilvie-Grant 1893). This journal was also known as *Die Schwalbe*. Reference to that however shows that Blasius in fact named it at a meeting of the Braunschweig Verein für Naturwissenschaft (Nat. Hist. Soc.) in December 1890 and that a report of that meeting appeared on 3 January 1891, in the *Braunschweigischen Anzeigen* (Blasius 1891a). The three syntypes are extant, one in Braunschweig and two in Berlin (Hinkelmann & Heinze 1990).

Blasius had used this newspaper before to name Philippine, and other, birds and insisted that his names antedated those of Sharpe (Blasius 1888b). Rand (1955) eventually stated that the names in the *Braunschweigischen Anzeigen* must be accepted. Despite Rand's statement that Blasius (1888b) had "resolved the confusion", his names were not readily accepted in the first half of last century, since newspapers were not felt to be proper media for new scientific names. Since Rand (1955) they have been fully accepted.

In firmly supporting all Blasius's names, Rand (1955) did not mention *Polyplectron nehrkornae*, presumably because it was by now in synonymy. Nonetheless the correct citation for this is *Polyplectron Nehrkorndae* Blasius, 1891, *Braunschweigischen Anzeigen*, 2, p. 15.

Conclusion

Correctly arranged in chronological order these three names are therefore:

Polyplectrum napoleonis Lesson (1831, June), *Traité Orn.*, part 8, p. 650.

Polyplectron emphanum Temminck (1832, Dec), in Temminck & Laugier (1820-1839), *Pl. Col.*, Livr. 91, pl. 540.

Polyplectron Nehrkorndae Blasius, 1891, *Braunschweigischen Anzeigen*, 2, p. 15.

Lesson on page 650 used only the French vernacular name, but he referred to page 437, where the scientific name *napoleonis* had appeared in April 1831 as a *nomen nudum*. This has previously been considered to meet the appropriate requirements for acceptance (Ogilvie-Grant 1893, 1897) and under present rules (ICZN 1999) still does.

To sustain the resurrection of this prior name it is necessary to address Art. 23.9 of the Code (ICZN 1999), since it might be argued that the name *Polyplectron emphanum* is too well established to be rejected. This Article states that two conditions must be met if priority is to be over-ridden. First, it must be shown that the senior name has not been used as a valid name after 1899, and second it must be shown that the junior name has been used "in at least 25 works, published by at least 10 authors in the immediately preceding 50 years and encompassing a span of not less than 10 years".

In this case the second condition can probably be met. Lowe's use of *emphanus* (1925) was adopted by Peters (1932), and by subsequent literature pertaining to Philippine birds (Delacour & Mayr 1946, duPont 1971, Dickinson *et al.* 1991, Inskipp *et al.* 1996, Collar *et al.* 1999, Kennedy *et al.* 2000). Delacour (1951), and more recent works on pheasants (e.g. McGowan & Garson 1995), have also used this name.

The first condition cannot be met. McGregor (1909), who explicitly agreed with Bourns & Worcester (1894) about the name *nehrkornae*, used the name *Polyplectron napoleonis* and, as stated above, that seems to have been unchallenged from 1897 until Lowe's (1925) review. During this period *napoleonis* was used by Beebe (1922). It is therefore necessary to apply the name *Polyplectron napoleonis* citing *Polyplectrum* [sic] *napoleonis* Lesson, 1831 (June), *Traité Orn.*, part 8, p. 650.

Acknowledgements

This paper derives from the broader study and thanks are due to René Dekker at the National Museum of Natural History, Leiden for agreeing that this highlight might be published separately. In the longer paper (Dickinson, 2001) will be found numerous other acknowledgements in connection with the overall report. The suggestion to publish this separately so that it might come to the attention of those engaged in pheasant breeding as well as ornithologists was made by Alain Hennache of the Parc Zoologique Clères, France and endorsed by Richard Howard, Chairman of the World Pheasant Association.

The Temminck manuscript in Leiden was not previously known but a search was suggested by Gerlof Mees after reading a draft of the overall study. For obtaining a copy of pages from the *Braunschweigischen Anzeigen* and for helping with the translation from German thanks are due to Norbert Bahr. For advice on the validity of Lesson's name, in the context of its proposal, and for a discussion on the options available upon finding that it has priority, I am grateful to Philip Tubbs of the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature. Early drafts of this have been read and commented upon by Norbert Bahr, Geoffrey Davison, René Dekker, Alain Hennache, Christoph Hinkelmann, Robert S. Kennedy and David Wells, to all of whom thanks are due.

References:

- Beebe, W. 1922. *Monograph of Pheasants* Vol. 4. H.F. & G. Witherby, London.
- Blasius, W. 1888a. Die Vögel von Palawan. *Ornis* 4: 301-320.
- Blasius, W. 1888b. Letter to the Editor. *Ibis* (5) 6: 373-375.
- Blasius, W. 1891a. *Polyplectron nehrkornae* nov. sp. *Braunschweigischen Anzeigen* 2: 14-15.
- Blasius, W. 1891b. *Polyplectron nehrkornae* nov. sp. *Mitth. orn. Ver. Wien*, p.1.
- Bourns, F.S. & Worcester, D.C. 1894. Preliminary notes on the birds and mammals collected by the Menage Scientific Expedition to the Philippine islands. *Occas. Pap. Minn. Acad. Nat. Sci.* 1: 1-64.
- Collar, N. C., Mallari, N. A. D. & Tablanza, B. R. 1999. *Threatened birds of the Philippines*. Bookmark Inc., Makati, Philippines.
- Crotch, G. R. 1869. Letter to the Editor. *Ibis* (2) 5: 499-500.
- Delacour, J. 1951. *The pheasants of the world*. Country Life Ltd., London.
- Delacour, J. & Mayr, E. 1946. *Birds of the Philippines*. Macmillan, New York.
- Dickinson, E. C. 2001. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 9. The "Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées" of Temminck & Laugier (1820-1839). *Zool. Verh., Leiden*, 335: 7-56.
- Dickinson, E. C., Kennedy, R. S. & Parkes, K. C. 1991. *The birds of the Philippines*. B.O.U. Check-list No. 12, Tring.
- duPont, J.E. 1971. *Philippine birds*. Delaware Museum of Natural History, Greenville.

- Gray, G. R. 1867. *List of birds in the British Museum, Gallinae*. British Museum, London.
- Hinkelmann, C. & Heinze, G-M. 1990. Die Typusexemplare der von Wilhelm Blaius beschriebenen Vogel. *Braunsch. Naturkd. Schr.* 3: 609-628.
- Inskipp, T., Lindsey, N. & Duckworth, W. 1996. *An annotated check-list of the birds of the Oriental Region*. Oriental Bird Club, Sandy.
- ICZN. 1999. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*. 4th. Edition. London.
- Kennedy, R. S., Gonzales, P. C., Dickinson, E. C., Miranda, H. C. & Fisher, T. H. 2000. *A guide to the birds of the Philippines*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Lesson, R. P. 1831a. (Apr.). *Traité d'Ornithologie ou Tableau Méthodique des ordres, sous-ordres, familles, tribus, genres, sous-genres et races d'oiseaux*. Pt. 7, p. 487. Levrault, Strasbourg.
- Lesson, R. P. 1831b (Jun). *Traité d'Ornithologie ou Tableau Méthodique des ordres, sous-ordres, familles, tribus, genres, sous-genres et races d'oiseaux*. Pt. 8, p. 650. Levrault, Strasbourg.
- Lowe, P. R. 1925. Some notes on the genus *Polyplectron*. *Ibis* (12) 1: 476-484.
- McGowan, P. J. K. & Garson, P. J. 1995. *Status survey and conservation action plan 1995-1999 Pheasants*. IUCN, Gland.
- McGregor, R. C. 1909. *A manual of Philippine birds*. Pt. 1. Bureau of Science, Manila.
- Ogilvie-Grant, W. R. 1893. *Catalogue of the birds in the British Museum*. 22. Game Birds. Trustees of the British Museum, London.
- Ogilvie-Grant, W. R. 1897. *A handbook to the Game-birds*. Vol. 2. W. H. Allen & Co., London.
- Peters, J. L. 1934. *Check-list of birds of the world*. Vol. 2. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rand, A. L. 1955. Philippine bird names of Blasius. *Auk*, 72: 210-212.
- Sclater, P. L. 1863. List of the species of Phasianidae. *Proc. Zool. Soc., Lond.* 31: 113-127.
- Sherborn, C. D. 1898. On the dates of Temminck and Laugier's 'Planches coloriées'. *Ibis*, (7) 4: 485-488.
- Stone, W. 1899. A study of the type specimens of birds in the collection of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, with a brief history of the collection. *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci., Philad.* 51: 5-62.
- Temminck, C. J., [1831] 1832, in Temminck, C.J. & Baron Meiffren Laugier de Chartreuse. 1820-1839. *Nouveau Recueil de Planches Coloriées*. Dufour et d'Ocagne; Levrault, Paris.
- Tweeddale, Viscount. 1878. Contributions to the ornithology of the Philippines. No. IX. On the Collection made by Mr. A. H. Everett in the island of Palawan. *Proc. Zool. Soc., Lond.* 46: 611-624.
- Whitehead, J. 1890. Notes on the birds of Palawan. *Ibis* (6) 2: 38-61.
- Zimmer, J. T. 1926. Catalogue of the Edward E. Ayer Ornithological Library. Pt.2. *Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Zool.* 16 (2): 365-706.
- Address*: Edward C. Dickinson, The Trust for Oriental Ornithology, Flat 3, Bolsover Court, 19 Bolsover Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex BN20 7JG. E-mail: asiaorn@ftech.co.uk